

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 55-61, 64-68, and 70-82, while objecting to claims 62, 63, and 69. In addition, the Examiner indicated that claim 83 is allowed. Claims 55-61 and 64-82 have been cancelled herein without prejudice. Claims 62 and 63 have been rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, no new matter has been added.

In light of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 62, 63, and 83.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant respectfully notes that an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form filed August 25, 2004 has not been returned. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests return of an initialed copy. For the Examiner's convenience, a copy of the PTO-1449 form filed August 25, 2004 is attached hereto. In addition, copies of the listed references can be resubmitted upon request.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 55-61, 64-68, and 70-82 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking enablement. The Examiner also rejected claims 55-61, 64-68, and 70-82 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking written description. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections. Applicant's specification fully enables and adequately describes the subject matter recited in previous claims 55-61, 64-68, and 70-82. Claims 55-61, 64-68, and 70-82 have been cancelled herein without prejudice. Thus, these rejections are moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 64-69 and 82 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have understood the subject matter recited in

previous claims 64-69 and 82. Claims 64-69 and 82 have been cancelled herein without prejudice. Thus, these rejections are moot.

Objected claims


The Examiner objected to claims 62, 63, and 69 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 62 and 63 have been rewritten as suggested, while claim 69 has been cancelled herein without prejudice. Thus, claims 62 and 63 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 62, 63, and 83. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if such would further prosecution. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 12, 2004



J. Patrick Finn III, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 44,109

Fish & Richardson P.C., P.A.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696